UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,816	07/24/2001	Kazuho Oku	13280-003001	6289

26161   7590   11/14/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/911,816	OKU, KAZUHO
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas R. Taylor	2141	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 August 2006</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>2-9,11,13,14,20 and 23-27</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>2-9,11,13,14,20 and 23-27</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 July 2001</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

       1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 2-9, 11, 13, 14, 20, and 23-27 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed August 21st, 2006, and July 27th, 2006, have been fully considered. The arguments with respect to the claims rejected under Levy are deemed not persuasive. Applicant's remaining arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

3.   In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that:

(A) The prior art of Levy fails to teach determining whether an input URL is a channel URL that is a set of URLs followed by requesting contents from a plurality of web servers associated with the respective URLs.

As to point (A), Levy teaches a customer (user) entering their information (col. 6 lines 8-19; col. 5, lines 45-54) and an input URL (col. 4, lines 43-45) that corresponds a web server of a set (col. 4, lines 45-51; col. 5, lines 55-64) that proves the contents of a predetermined subject (col. 5, lines 47-51). If correctly made, a request is sent to a plurality of web servers for the content that is associated with the respective URL (col. 4, lines 53-58; col. 5, lines 14-21).

(B) The prior of Levy fails to teach binding gathered contents from a plurality of web servers, as it merely teaches gathering information.

As to point (B), Levy teaches retrieving information from a plurality of web servers (process of fig. 8) and binding the desired content (col. 9, lines 15-47) After receiving the information, it is bound and transmitted before it reaches its destination (col. 9, lines 15-47; col. 9, lines 60-65).

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 2, 3, 7 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities:

          In claims 2 and 7, the use of multiple "; and".

          In claim 3, "billing sewer".

          In claim 23 (part c), capitalized "URLS".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 2, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 20, 23, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Levy (U.S. Patent 6,556,997) and Bickmore et al. (U.S.

Patent 6,857,102).

7.   As per claims 2, 7, and 20, Levy teaches:

a user information database for storing user identification (ID) information; (Levy,

col. 5, lines 45-55 and fig. 4, item 20)

an authentication server for performing authentication based upon the user ID

information by using the user information database when the user ID information and a

uniform resource locator (URL) of a web server is input, and outputting the input URL

after performing the authentication; and (Levy, col. 5, lines 45-55; col. 6, lines 8-18 and

fig. 4; see also col. 5, lines 45-54; fig. 1, item 15; and col. 4, lines 42-54)

a data server for determining whether the input URL provided by the

authentication server is the channel URL that is of a set of URLs, each URL of the set

corresponding to a web server that provides the contents of a predetermined subject,

and if so, (Levy col. 4, lines 45-51; col. 5, lines 47-51 and 55-64)

. requesting the contents from a plurality of web servers associated with the

respective URLs of the set, (Levy, col. 4, lines 53-58; col. 5, lines 14-21)

processing the received contents into a predetermined format, gathering the

contents of the predetermined subject, binding the gathered contents into a single

channel, and transmitting the single channel of contents to the portable terminal (Levy,

col. 9, lines 15-47 and 60-65).

However, while Levy teaches reformatting for certain transmissions (Levy, e.g.,

fig. 1), Levy fails to teach

where the data server further comprises an image compressor for receiving the

contents from the web server, and reducing the image sizes or a number of colors

according to the specification of the portable terminal; and

a proxy unit for monitoring data transmitted by the web server, and when the

contents transmitted by the web server include image information, calling the image

compressor.

Bickmore teaches an image compressor that receives contents from a web

server and reduces the images according to the specifications of a portable terminal

(Bickmore, col. 9, lines 27-40 where the reduction is based on the display at col. 13,

lines 7-23). Bickmore accomplishes this through the use of a proxy unit that monitors

the data transmitted by the server and calls the image compressor as needed

(Bickmore, col. 12, lines 33-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Levy and Bickmore to provide the reduction of

Bickmore in the system of Levy, because doing so would be ideal for providing broad

access to web content from a wide range of devices by producing legible, navigable,

and aesthetically pleasing content without a loss of information (Bickmore, col. 3, lines

55-60).

8.   As per claim 5, Levy-Bickmore teaches the system wherein the data server

requests the contents, the web server provides the contents to the data server in the

case a user who accesses via the portable terminal is a service user who can receive

the contents (Levy, col. 9, lines 15-47, and fig. 8).

9.   As per claim 11, Levy-Bickmore teaches the system wherein the data server

processes the contents according to a display specification of the portable terminal and

transmits them (Levy, col. 8, lines 44-68; see also the cellular delivery mechanism item

16 of fig. 1).

10.   As per claim 13, Levy-Bickmore teaches the system wherein the data server

further comprises a filter for filtering information that is inappropriate or is not needed for

the portable terminal among the contents provided by the web server (Levy, col. 8, lines

44-68, where content that is not pre-selected is filtered out).

11.   As per claim 14, Levy-Bickmore teaches the system wherein the data server

further comprises a channel generator for binding a plurality of contents of a

predetermined field provided by the web server into a single channel (Levy, col. 9, lines

15-47, and fig. 8).

12.   As per claim 23, Levy teaches a contents-providing method of a system for

receiving contents from a plurality of web servers and providing the contents to a

portable terminal connected via a network, a contents-providing method comprising:

(a) extracting user information corresponding to user identification (ID)

information and authenticating the user when the user ID information and an input

uniform resource locator (URL) of a web server for providing the contents is input by the

portable terminal; (Levy, col. 5, lines 45-55 and fig. 4, item 20; col. 6, lines 8-18 and fig.

4; see also col. 5, lines 45-54; fig. 1, item 15; and col. 4, lines 42-54)

(b) determining whether the input URL is a channel URL that is of a set of URLs,

each URL of the set corresponding to a web server that provides contents of a

predetermined subject; (Levy col. 4, lines 45-51; col. 5, lines 47-51 and 55-64)

(c) requesting the contents from a plurality of web servers associated with the

respective URLs of the set when the input URL is the channel URL; (Levy, col. 4, lines

53-58; col. 5, lines 14-21)

(e) gathering the contents of the predetermined subject and binding the gathered

contents into a single channel of contents; and (f) transmitting the single channel of

contents to the portable terminal via the network (Levy, col. 9, lines 15-47 and 60-65).

However, while Levy teaches reformatting for certain transmissions (Levy, e.g.,

fig. 1), Levy fails to teach

(d) monitoring the contents received from the plurality of web servers in response

to the requesting to determine whether any of the received contents include image

information, and if any of the received contents include image information, converting

the image information by reducing sizes or number of color of images according to the standard of the portable terminal.

Bickmore teaches an image compressor that receives contents from a web server and reduces the images according to the specifications of a portable terminal (Bickmore, col. 9, lines 27-40 where the reduction is based on the display at col. 13, lines 7-23). Bickmore accomplishes this through the use of a proxy unit that monitors the data transmitted by the server and calls the image compressor as needed (Bickmore, col. 12, lines 33-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Levy and Bickmore to provide the reduction of Bickmore in the system of Levy, because doing so would be ideal for providing broad access to web content from a wide range of devices by producing legible, navigable, and aesthetically pleasing content without a loss of information (Bickmore, col. 3, lines 55-60).

13.   As per claim 26, Levy-Bickmore teaches the system wherein the method further comprises:

requesting a password from the portable terminal when a password input request for authenticating service users who can receive desired contents from a web server is generated according to the contents request; and

providing the password to the web server and authenticating the service user when the password is provided to the portable terminal (Levy, col. 5, lines 45-55 and fig.

4, item 20; col. 6, lines 8-18 and fig. 4; see also col. 5, lines 45-54; fig. 1, item 15; and

col. 4, lines 42-54).

14.   As per claim 27, Levy-Bickmore teaches the system wherein when it is

determined that the corresponding user is a service user according to the password

provided by the portable terminal in the step of providing the contents, the web server

provides the contents to the user (Levy, col. 4, lines 42-54 and the corresponding items

of fig. 1).

15.   Claims 3, 4, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Levy (U.S. Patent 6,556,997) and Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent

6,857,102), further in view of Ronen et al. (U.S. Patent 5,905,736).

16.   As per claim 3, Levy-Bickmore teaches the system further wherein the user

information database stores user information corresponding to the user ID information,

the authentication server extracts user information corresponding to the user ID

information from the user information database and outputs the same with input URL

when performing authentication based on the user ID information (Levy, col. 5, lines 45-

55 and fig. 4, item 20; col. 6, lines 8-18 and fig. 4; see also col. 5, lines 45-54; fig. 1,

item 15; and col. 4, lines 42-54).

      However, though Levy-Bickmore teaches billing based on usage (Levy, col. 7,

lines 42-45), Levy-Bickmore fails to teach the system further comprises a billing server

for settling fees for the contents provided by the web servers having the provided URLs

based on the user information provided by the authentication server.

Ronen teaches a billing server for settling fees for a variety of web server

provided content based on URLs (Ronen, col. 3, lines 26-33 and col. 3 line 65 to col. 4

line 19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Levy-Bickmore and Ronen to provide the billing

system of Ronen in the system of Levy-Bickmore, because doing so would enable

transparent charging for Internet content receiving services (Ronen, col. 1 line 65 to col.

2 line 3).

17.   As per claim 4, Levy-Bickmore-Ronen teaches the system further wherein the

billing server settles the respective fees of the web servers (Ronen, col. 3, lines 26-33

and col. 3 line 65 to col. 4 line 19) corresponding to the channel URL when the URLs

provided by the portable terminal is the channel URL, the data server transmits the

settlement results to the respective web servers corresponding to the URL of the

channel URL when the settlement results of the billing server are provided, and the

respective web servers determine the settlement results and when the settlement of the

fees is performed and provide the corresponding contents to the data server (Ronen,

col. 3, lines 26-33 and col. 3 line 65 to col. 4 line 19).

18.   As per claim 24, Levy-Bickmore teaches the above, yet fails to teach settling the

fees for the contents provided by the web servers corresponding to the respective

channel URLs of the channel.

Ronen teaches settling fees for contents provided by a web server corresponding

to respective channel URLs of the channel based upon the user information (Ronen,

col. 3, lines 26-33 and col. 3 line 65 to col. 4 line 19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Levy-Bickmore and Ronen to provide the billing

system of Ronen in the system of Levy-Bickmore, because doing so would enable

transparent charging for Internet content receiving services (Ronen, col. 1 line 65 to col.

2 line 3).

19.   As per claim 25, Levy-Bickmore teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein

when the contents are requested in (c), the settlement results are provided to the web

servers corresponding to the respective URLs of the channel URL.

Ronen teaches when contents are requested the settlement results are provided

to the web servers corresponding to the respective URLs of the channel URL (Ronen,

col. 3, lines 26-33 and col. 3 line 65 to col. 4 line 19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Levy-Bickmore and Ronen to provide the billing

system of Ronen in the system of Levy-Bickmore, because doing so would enable

transparent charging for Internet content receiving services (Ronen, col. 1 line 65 to col.

2 line 3).

20.   Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy

(U.S. Patent 6,556,997) and Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent 6,857,102), further in view of

Fuh et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,474).

21.   As per claim 6, Levy-Bickmore teaches the system wherein the data server

provides the user ID information provided by the authentication server to a plurality of

web servers respectively corresponding to the URL of the channel URL (Levy, col. 6,

lines 36-57), yet fails to teach

        wherein the respective web servers request a password input for authenticating

the service user when the data server requests the contents, and they perform

authentication via the user's password and the user ID information input via the portable

terminal.

        Fuh teaches an authentication server authenticating upon the user ID information

using a user information database (Fuh, col. 8, lines 25-33, and col. 12, lines 26-38)

when the user ID information and a URL (Fuh, col. 7, lines 30-40) of a web server is

input, and outputting the URL after performing the authentication (Fuh, col. 8, lines 33-

37, wherein allowing authorization outputs the URL).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Levy-Bickmore and Fuh to provide the

authentication system of Fuh in the system of Levy-Bickmore, because doing so would

improve the security of the network system without the common drawbacks of

conventional approaches (Fuh, col. 1, line 58 to col. 2, line 9).

22.   Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy

(U.S. Patent 6,556,997), Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent 6,857,102), and Ronen et al. (U.S.

Patent 5,905,736), further in view of Kappel (U.S. Patent 5,905,736).

23.   As per claim 8, Levy-Bickmore-Ronen teaches processing and transmitting

contents provided by the web server (Levy, col. 9, lines 15-47, and fig. 8). Levy-

Bickmore-Ronen also teaches an authentication server that provides user information

extracted from a user information database (Levy, col. 5, lines 45-55 and fig. 4, item 20;

col. 6, lines 8-18 and fig. 4; see also col. 5, lines 45-54; fig. 1, item 15; and col. 4, lines

42-54).

However, Levy-Bickmore-Ronen fails to teach wherein the system further

comprises an advertisement server for providing advertisement contents, wherein the

advertisement server extracts the advertisement contents according to the user

information provided by the data server and provides the advertisement contents to the

data server, and the data server processes the advertisement contents provided by the

advertisement server.

Kappel teaches an advertisement server that extracts advertisement content

according to user information and provides the contents back to the data server, which

then processes the contents (Kappel, col. 9, lines 47-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Levy-Bickmore-Ronen and Kappel to provide

the advertisement server of Kappel in the system of Levy-Bickmore-Ronen, because

doing so would allow additional revenue from advertisements targeting the users logged

into the system (Kappel, col. 2, lines 53-55).

24.   Claims 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy

(U.S. Patent 6,556,997) and Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent 6,857,102), further in view of

Kappel (U.S. Patent 5,905,736).

25.   As per claim 9, Levy-Bickmore teaches processing and transmitting contents

provided by the web server (Levy, col. 9, lines 15-47, and fig. 8). Levy-Bickmore also

teaches an authentication server that provides user information extracted from a user

information database (Levy, col. 5, lines 45-55 and fig. 4, item 20; col. 6, lines 8-18 and

fig. 4; see also col. 5, lines 45-54; fig. 1, item 15; and col. 4, lines 42-54).

However, Levy-Bickmore fails to teach wherein the system further comprises an

advertisement server for providing advertisement contents, and wherein the

advertisement server extracts the advertisement contents according to the user

information provided by the data server and provides the advertisement contents to the

data server, and the data server processes the advertisement contents provided by the

advertisement server and the contents provided by the web server.

Kappel teaches an advertisement server that extracts advertisement content

according to user information and provides the contents back to the data server, which

then processes the contents (Kappel, col. 9, lines 47-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Levy-Bickmore and Kappel to provide the

advertisement server of Kappel in the system of Levy-Bickmore, because doing so

would allow additional revenue from advertisements targeting the users logged into the

system (Kappel, col. 2, lines 53-55).

Conclusion

26.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Taylor
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER